

Responses to Comments in Letter 148 from Candice Ambrosio and Dean Rogers, Bellingham Residents

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. EFSEC reviewed and accepted the Draft EIS that they released for public comment in March 2000. The Final EIS has been revised to reflect written comments and the comments given at public meetings held on April 3 and 4, 2000.

Comments on the Draft EIS stimulate discussion and thoughts about how to change or condition the proposal to further protect the environment. Lead Agency review (EFSEC in this case) of the comments on the Draft EIS offers the opportunity to improve the completeness, accuracy, and objectivity of the environmental analysis of a proposal. Improvements can then be made in the Final EIS that will provide information to the decision makers. In some cases the proponent may choose to modify the proposal based on comments made during the Draft EIS comment period. In that instance, the modifications would also be described and evaluated in the Final EIS. (SEPA Handbook, page 49)

2. Thank you for the comment. Discussion of impacts in Canada has been added to various sections of this Final EIS.
3. See Letter 142, Response to Comments 3 and 4.
4. EFSEC's decisions on these matters are guided as follows:

"Need and consistency" is a single concept that is not just a demonstration of the need to produce power based on the current supply and demand. The need and consistency issue poses a broader question of whether an energy facility at a particular site will produce a net benefit after balancing the availability and costs of energy to consumers and the impact to the environment.

5. See Letter 142, Response to Comment 9 for discussion regarding conservation and new generating resources.
6. The 115 kV power lines that run through Whatcom County are no longer part of the project. Only the 230 kV line to Canada is included in the project.
7. Please see General Response M for a discussion of the BACT determination process.
8. Please see General Response H for a discussion of the environmental risks that would be posed by the 2.5-million-gallon diesel fuel tank. Also see Letter 143, Response to Comment 7 for a discussion of measures that are planned for mitigation of seismic hazards to the tank and facility in general, and Letter 11, Response to Comment 2 for discussion of engineered safeguards for the diesel tank. Adverse weather conditions may impact the accessibility and safety of local roadways.

9. Please see General Response J for a discussion of the impact of the facility on flooding.
10. The 115 kV power lines that run through Whatcom County are no longer part of the project. Only the 230 kV line to Canada is included in the project.
11. Wildlife habitat loss is an unavoidable adverse impact of the project, although rare, threatened, and endangered species would not be significantly affected. The Settlement Agreement between the WDFW and Sumas Energy 2 (Volume 1, Appendix G) would maintain impacts on fish and wildlife below the threshold of significance.
12. Thank you for your comments.